

REMARKS

This is a full and timely response to the outstanding non-final Office Action mailed May 3, 2005. Reconsideration and allowance of the application and pending claims are respectfully requested.

I. Objections to the Claims

Claims 7-8 were objected to because of informalities cited in the Office Action. Accordingly, claim 7 has been amended to overcome the objections. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the objections of claim 7 and claim 8 (which depends from claim 7) to be withdrawn.

II. Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 1-11 and 18-23 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by *Shteyn* (U.S. Patent 6,782,253 B1). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Regarding claims 1-11, Applicants submit that *Shteyn* does not teach or suggest a method or system performing the steps of "associating one or more device with said at least one unique identifier based upon a unique identifier acquired by each device at a location associated with the unique identifier" and "providing an indication of said one or more device or service that are associated with said at least one unique identifier, such that a first device associated with a first unique identifier is made aware of other devices or services that are available for use and are associated with the first unique identifier," as recited in independent claim 1.

Rather, *Shteyn* discloses services being associated with a beacon by a service provider author via "simple HTML templates." See col. 8, lines 12-41. Further, *Shteyn* discloses at most mobile devices receiving facilitation signals which enables users to obtain information about services that interest them. See col. 3, liens 9-11.

As such, *Shteyn* does not teach or suggest at least the steps of "associating one or more device with said at least one unique identifier based upon a unique identifier acquired by each device at a location associated with the unique identifier" and "providing an indication of said one or more device or service that are associated with said at least one unique identifier, such that a first device associated with a first unique identifier is made aware of other devices [which also acquired a unique identifier] or

services that are available for use and are associated with the first unique identifier." Accordingly, claim 1 and claims 2-6 (which depend from claim 1) are allowable over *Shteyn*, for at least that reason.

Regarding claims 7-9, Applicants submit that *Shteyn* fails to teach or suggest at least the steps of "receiving a message containing a first unique identifier" and "replying to the sender of the message with a list of available devices or services for a location corresponding to said first unique identifier," as recited in independent claim 7.

In contrast, *Shteyn* discloses that a mobile device may receive a facilitation signal and use it to acquire general information of interest, but it fails to show that a device is made aware of other devices in the same location that have acquired the same unique identifier for the same location. Therefore, *Shteyn* fails to disclose all of the features of claim 7. Accordingly, claim 7 and claim 8 (which depends from claim 7) are allowable over *Shteyn*, for at least that reason.

Regarding claims 9 and 10-11, Applicants submit that *Shteyn* fails to teach or suggest at least the steps of "receiving a report that a device has acquired a unique identifier corresponding to particular location, the device being located at the particular location" and "replying to said client device with a list of available devices or services for the location, wherein said available devices on the list reported acquisition of said unique identifier," as recited in claim 9. For example, any list of devices or services that may be disclosed in *Shteyn* are programmed to be associated with a beacon, as previously discussed, and are not the result of acquiring and acknowledging acquisition of a unique identifier. Therefore, *Shteyn* fails to disclose all of the features of claim 9. Accordingly, claim 9 and claims 10-11 (which depend from claim 9) are allowable over *Shteyn*, for at least that reason.

Regarding claims 18 and 19-23, Applicants submit that *Shteyn* fails to teach or suggest at least the step of "receiving a reply from the entity, the reply containing a list of available devices or services for the location, wherein the available devices acquired the unique identifier at the location and reported acquisition of the unique identifier to the entity," as recited in claim 18, since *Shteyn* fails to teach or suggest the aspect of receiving a list of available devices for a location, where each device acknowledges acquisition of a unique identifier for a location. Accordingly, claim 18 and claims 19-21 (which depend from claim 18) are allowable over *Shteyn*, for at least that reason. Likewise, claims 22-23 are allowable for similar reasons.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application and all pending claims are hereby courteously requested. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephonic conference would expedite the examination of this matter, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (770) 933-9500.

Respectfully submitted,



Charles W. Griggers

Registration No. 47,283